

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-20 were rejected.

According to the cover sheet of the office action, the specification was objected to by the Examiner. However, there is no objection listed in the detailed action. Clarification of any objection to the specification is requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-20 were objected to because of the following informalities and/or defects:

Claims 1, 5 and 10 each need to further clarify what exactly the terms of "which" refer to in the claims. This term has been eliminated or clarified by amendment to the claims above.

In claim 10, line 8, the term of "each include" should read as: --includes--. This has been corrected by amendment above.

Claim 15 needs to further clarify the direction of each of the fuse regions, given that a fuse region is normally a 2-D area that has at least two directions along its edges. The fuse region has first and second directions on the terminal ends of the fuses, with a 'same direction' for the fuse regions, as amended above

In claims 16 and 17, the term of "a predetermined" should read as: --by a predetermined--. This has been corrected by amendment above.

Claim 18 needs to further clarify the terms of: "the same direction," "one" and "perpendicular to the plurality of fuse regions" (see the above note for claim 15). Similar amendments to those made in claim 15 have been made for claim 18.

Claims 19 and 20 need to further clarify the relationship(s) between the first and second fuses and the fuse regions already recited in claim 18. The amendments above provide this clarification. It is therefore submitted that these amendments have overcome the objections raised above, and withdrawal of these objections is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 5-6 and 9, as being best understood in view of the claim objections above, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoon (KR 2001-0029286 (Application No. 99-42035), June 2001; of record).

Yoon discloses a fuse bank having laser fuses arranged in a layer such that the fusing regions of each fuse is arranged at an angle from the connecting lines at each end. As disclosed in Yoon, the area of the fusing region is dependent upon the length of the fusing

region and the width of the fusing region, where in the width of the fusing region is dependent upon the angle of the fusing region from the connecting ends. See Yoon, column 3, line 35 through column 4, line 15. The width of the fusing region, used as part of the analysis of the area of the fusing region, is dependent upon the angle of the fusing region with respect to the connecting ends.

As amended, claims 1 and 5 require that the lateral width of the fuse bank be directly proportional to the pitch distance between the connecting lines, as set out in the specification on page 6, third paragraph. This is not shown nor taught by the prior art, as discussed above. It is therefore submitted that claims 1 and 5 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and claims 6 and 9 depend from claim 5. These claims inherently contain all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-4, 7-8 and 10-20, as being best understood in view of the claim objections above, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoon in view of AAPA (Applicant's Admitted Prior Art) and/or Sakuta (Sakuta, et al., U.S. 5,208,782).

The office action states that Yoon does not disclose that the connecting lines can be bent so as to have a right angle to the fuse region's direction and/or that neighboring fuse banks/groups can be symmetrical about the direction perpendicular to the fuse region's direction. The office action further states that using right angles is obvious over the AAPA. However, AAPA does not disclose using right angles where the entire fuse is disposed in a plane.

The addition of Sakuta does not overcome the deficiency of Yoon with respect to the lateral width of the fuse bank being directly proportional to the pitch distance between the connecting lines. As amended claim 1 and 5 now include that limitation, claims 3-4 and 7-8 which depend from those claims respectively, inherently include that limitation. It is therefore submitted that claims 3-4 and 7-8 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 10, 15 and 18 have been amended to include this limitation, similar to the limitation added in claims 1 and 5, that is not taught by Yoon, Sakuta or the combination thereof. It is therefore submitted that claims 10, 15 and 18, and their respective dependent

claims 11-14, 16-17 and 19-20 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office via facsimile number
(571) 273-8300 on February 28, 2006.

Li Mei Vermilya

Li Mei Vermilya